Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Exploration and Discovery

THE FREER MANUSCRIPTS OF DEUTERONOMY–JOSHUA

Two years and a half have passed since Mr. Freer's acquisition of Greek manuscripts of Deut.-Josh., Psalms, the Gospels, and the Pauline epistles was announced at the University of Chicago, December 30, 1907. In the following February, the first authoritative account of the manuscripts, from the pen of Professor Henry A. Sanders, appeared in the *Biblical World*. Since that time Professor Sanders has been steadily at work upon the manuscripts, and he now publishes a collation of the Deut.-Josh. manuscript together with full introductions dealing with its paleography, contents, and type of text. Simultaneously with Professor Sanders' extended monograph a facsimile edition of the Deut.-Josh. manuscript has been published, and, through the liberality of Mr. Freer, copies have been presented to leading libraries at home and abroad.

The manuscript itself, we are told, is, with the other three, to be presented to the Smithsonian Institution, for the people of the United States. Scholars will be quick to express their appreciation of the beautiful facsimile edition so generously distributed among the leading American and continental libraries. American scholarship in particular will find satisfaction in the bringing of this noble manuscript to this country, in its presentation to the nation, and in its publication and distribution in this most desirable of all forms. Too much can hardly be said in recognition of Mr. Freer's wise and tactful generosity in purchasing and publishing this manuscript, and in presenting it to the nation.

We are less confident of the propriety of naming the collection the Washington Manuscripts, but here, as often elsewhere, we must defer to the judgment of the donor and the editor of them. Yet many will still prefer to call them the Freer Manuscripts notwithstanding Mr. Freer's reluctance to permit his name to be attached to them. The symbol Θ has been agreed upon for the manuscript by the Cambridge editors of the Octateuch, Messrs. Brooke and McLean.

It is unfortunate that the exact body of text each page preserves is not indicated by chapter and verse at the bottom of each page of the facsimile, as in the facsimiles of Sarravianus, Bezae, the Heidelberg

prophets, the new Alexandrinus, etc. Indeed, it is a long time since a biblical manuscript facsimile has appeared without such references on every page. A finding list is, it is true, included in the preface to the facsimile, but it hardly makes up for this purely mechanical omission, which will, we fear, needlessly embarrass the consultation of this splendid edition.

It is a matter of regret that Dr. Sanders has not begun with his gospel manuscript, which gives promise of so much greater importance than the others. In dealing with the Deut.-Josh., however, he has shown characteristic patience and thoroughness. He has taken counsel, too, with numerous scholars, and their service is generously acknowledged. His monograph, *The Washington Manuscript of Deuteronomy and Joshua* (Macmillan, 1910), includes three admirable facsimile pages of the manuscript, which add much to its value and interest. It may be wondered whether in arrangement and proportion Dr. Sanders' treatment might not have been more convenient, comprehensive, and compact. The discussion of provenance might have been more critical and constructive, and the chapter on contents might have begun with a concise statement of what the manuscript contains. We miss a concise technical description of the make and contents of the manuscript. The textual discussion begins with Dr. Sanders' hexaplaric theory, which afterward proves to have no place in his charts of the manuscript's affinities. Reference to the monograph will, however, be made easy when the volume is completed by the companion monograph on the Psalter, and the whole is suitably indexed.

From the view now generally held that the Freer manuscripts, like the Berlin ones, came from the White Convent (Deir Abyad) near Akhmîm, Professor Sanders continues to dissent, though without offering any very specific reasons, or suggesting any alternative source. He continues to connect the Freer Gospels with a church of Timotheus, in the mediaeval Convent of the Vinedresser; a position rather precariously based on the corrected form of the subscription at the end of the Gospels manuscript. In speaking of the manuscript of Paul's epistles as the latest of the manuscripts, and assigning it to the fifth or sixth century, Professor Sanders seems to lose sight of the concluding quire of the Psalter, which Mr. Kenyon, with much probability, refers to the eighth or ninth. Indeed, it may be doubted whether Dr. Sanders is not too early in assigning the Deut.-Josh. manuscript to the fifth century, and preferably to the first half of it. It still seems to the present writer nearer to the sixth (?) century Homer palimpsest (Brit. Mus.

Ad. 17210) than it is to the Berlin P. 6794 or the Ephrem Codex; an impression which a study of the facsimile edition decidedly confirms.

The margins of the Deuteronomy exhibit occasional markings, of three different kinds. There are first the usual lectionary marks ἀρχ(ή) and τέλ(ος) or τέ(λος), each occurring twice. There are also, in the side margins, two occurrences of the sign ☩ — Χριστός or χρηστόν. Finally, a hook-shaped mark (ϑ) occurs forty-six times, always at the left of the column of text. All these signs Professor Sanders interprets as lectionary, that is, as marking church lessons.

Of these lectionary marks found by Professor Sanders in the margins of his Deuteronomy, those marking lections in chaps. 1 (vss. 8–17) and 10 (vss. 14–21) (ἀρχή and τέλος) will be at once accepted. These two lections are marked in the usual way, and they are the only lections from Deuteronomy which still stand in the service of the Greek church, both being read on January 30, July 13, and December 18.[1] A portion of these is also read on the seventh Sunday after Easter (usually in May) in honor of the holy fathers of the synod of Nicaea. Of these facts I am informed by my friend Mr. Martin Sprengling, to whose wide acquaintance with Greek lectionaries and other manuscripts I am much indebted. Professor Sanders has noted the appearance of these two lessons in a Paris lectionary (MS grec 243, Bibl. Nat.; A.D. 1133) as readings "belonging to the service in honor of the τιη᾽ ἁγίων πατέρων (the Holy Fathers of the IV Council) on the 16th of July" (p. 28). Dr. Sanders has not quite understood the statement of the Paris lectionary. It is of course plain that the 318 fathers cannot be those of the IV council (Chalcedon), but are those of the I (Nicaea), and that is what the Paris lectionary really says. It is here giving (foll. 207 vo, 208 ro) the three Old Testament lessons for July 16 in commemoration of the holy fathers of the IV council (Chalcedon): Μη(νί) ἰουλίῳ ις τῶν ἁγιών πατέρων τῆς δ̄ συνόδου: Ἐν τῇ μεγ(άλῃ) ἐκκλη(σίᾳ) εἰς τὸ λυχνικὸν τὴν εἴσοδ(ον). After designating the three lessons by their opening and closing words, the lectionary indicates where they may be found written out in full: προεγράφη δὲ ταῦτα τὰ ἀναγνώσματα· τῇ παραμο(νῇ) τῶν ἁγίων τιη ἁγίων πατέρων τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ· καὶ ἐκεῖ ζητ(είσθω). That is, these same readings were read on another, earlier, day, in honor of the 318 Nicene fathers. Thus the Paris lectionary by no means confuses the Nicene fathers with the Chalcedonian. The occurrence of the expression εἰς τὸ λυχνικόν in this lectionary is an interesting parallel to the late note at the head of Plate II: ☩ εἰς τὴν μνήμην

[1] These dates vary slightly with the Church calendar.

τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων εἰς τὸ λυχνηκόν. Dr. Sanders refers this note to the end of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh century, and certainly there is some papyrus evidence for so early a date; e.g., Oxyrhynchus P. 162 (=942), which Grenfell and Hunt refer to the sixth or seventh century. This lesson is still read, with Deut. 1:8–17, on July 13, in honor of the 640 fathers of Chalcedon, and to that commemoration, or one in honor of the 318 fathers of Nicaea, this marginal note probably refers.

The mark ⸸ which stands opposite Deut. 18:15 and 20:1 (hardly 19:21 as Dr. Sanders states) is interpreted as a lectionary sign, marking the beginning and ending of a lesson. Yet it is strange to use the same sign for both purposes; it is not easy to connect its second occurrence with the end of a lesson, since it stands squarely opposite the beginning of 20:1, not the end of 19:21; nor is this by itself a usual lectionary sign. Further, the long passage (29 verses) that these marks inclose is unknown to the lectionaries. It seems more probable that these marks have only their usual force of χρ(ηστόν), marking each passage as, in the annotator's opinion, profitable. In this connection Dr. Sanders refers to Origen, I Sam. Hom. III, as stating that "an Old Testament lection was too long to be read at a single sitting" (p. 29). As a matter of fact, but two of Origen's homilies on Samuel-Kings seem to be extant. Nor would the present passage (Deut. 18:15—20:1), if it were a lesson, require such a testimony, for it could be read in five minutes' time. Professor Sanders' remark and reference are doubtless based on Swete's statement (*Introduction*, 357) that in the homily "on the Witch of Endor (in I Sam. Hom. III) Origen complains that the O. T. lesson for the day was too long to be expounded at a single sitting." This is quite a different matter. Moreover, it is not at all certain that a definitely fixed church lesson is here intended by Origen. The reference given is misleading; for Migne's edition (cited by Swete, p. 429) it should be I Sam. Hom. II; and Klostermann makes it Hom. I.

The 46 interesting marks (ϽϽ) which another hand has scattered through the margins of Deuteronomy are also interpreted by Dr. Sanders as marking a series of lections. It must be owned that the evidence for this is not very convincing. The signs being alike, the reader could not tell whether a given sign marked the beginning or the end of his lection; nor indeed can Dr. Sanders. The signs are not happily placed for lections: The first reading would have to begin in the middle of what is in the English Bible a parenthesis. Some of them end in the midst of a sentence; some are not two verses in length; for one Dr.

Sanders can find no ending. Moreover, there is really no substantial support for these supposed lections in other lection systems; the partial and scattered coincidences Dr. Sanders cites are insufficient, and these supposed lections clash (in 10:17–19) with one of the manuscript's undoubted lections, 10:14–21. In view of the further fact that these marks are unknown as lectionary signs, it seems impossible to accept Dr. Sanders' ingenious explanation of them. It is altogether more likely that they indicate passages which the writer who made them found interesting, textually or otherwise, and to which he might wish to return. While no single principle of selection seems to have governed the scribe's marking of them, it is a striking fact that many of these passages are quoted or referred to in the New Testament or the Psalms—the parts of the Bible then as now most generally familiar. Others are perhaps noted as merely curious. It seems more than a coincidence that in so many cases the passages marked fall into groups of two or more, as though parallels within the book of Deuteronomy itself were being indicated. In form the mark may be related to the *paragraphus;* a mark somewhat similar, but angular, stands occasionally, usually at top or bottom of the column, in the margins of Alexandrinus, and it is not impossible that our annotator occasionally used this hook to mark what he felt should be a paragraph.

The textual affinities of the manuscript are discussed by Dr. Sanders at some length. These seem to him to be different in the two books concerned. In Deuteronomy the new uncial stands nearest to A and F, B being the next of kin; in Joshua, it has most in common with A, B and F being less directly related to it. Dr. Sanders devotes much attention to the relations of his manuscript to Origen's Hexapla, which he, in despite of ancient custom, prefers to call the Hexaplar. It is difficult to weigh the readings which Dr. Sanders identifies as Hexaplaric, as most of them are not supported by Field's edition, although that is the standard Dr. Sanders proposes (p. 33) to employ. It is evident that he has supplemented Field with other witnesses reported in the Holmes-Parsons edition, but upon just what principle it is not easy to understand. Students of the Freer manuscripts would have been helped by a fuller statement as to Dr. Sanders' own method. As it is, the Hexaplaric elements which Professor Sanders seeks to establish are not convincing, and his explanation of them as marginal glosses of Lucianic origin which have crept into the text (p. 38) is more ingenious than necessary.

The form δωη which Θ exhibits in Deut. 2:5 Dr. Sanders interprets

as a subjunctive, δώῃ, referring to Buttmann (1873), p. 46. A much fuller and more modern statement might have been found in Moulton's recent *Prolegomena*, while Helbing's new Septuagint grammar would have strengthened the discussion, and made it unnecessary for Dr. Sanders to appeal in support of his subjunctive δώῃ to the δῴη of Deut. 28:24, 25, which is an undoubted optative, as a glance at the passages will show. The latest Septuagint grammar, that of Thackeray, it may be added, does not recognize a subjunctive δώῃ in the Old Testament.

Professor Sanders' collation concludes his work. It is based upon Swete's manual edition, and is carefully made and clearly printed. Very rarely has a difference escaped the collator's eye; an examination of three or four chapters shows only that it is the first ἐπιθήσει of Deut. 7:15 which Θ replaces by ἐπάξει, and that Θ's ἡμῖν for Swete's ὑμῖν, Josh. 1:15, is unnoted. In this collation probably the most valuable part of Dr. Sanders' work will be found. It means a considerable addition to the most ancient textual materials for the reconstruction of the Septuagint text of Deuteronomy-Joshua, and while that task is so great and intricate that no single manuscript can be expected to dominate it, new materials are most welcome. It is fortunate that the facsimile and collation of the Freer manuscript have appeared in time to be used by the Cambridge editors, Messrs. Brooke and McLean, who have already published Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus, and are soon to publish Deuteronomy and Joshua. Meantime we shall await with interest Dr. Sanders' edition of the Freer Gospels, which promise to throw a new light upon the darkest part of New Testament textual study, the Western text.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO